

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in the Final Office Action mailed August 9, 2004 (hereinafter "Final Office Action"). The remarks herein supplement the arguments presented in Applicant's Amendment of May 17, 2004 (hereinafter "Applicant's Amendment"), which, in the interest of brevity, are hereby incorporated by reference.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Final Office Action cites passages from Wang that describe interference compensation operations performed on *received* signals. In other words, Wang generally relates to signal processing techniques to improve recovery of information in a received signal.

In sharp contrast, Claims 1, 21, 29 and 33 include recitations relating to interference compensation operations that occur on the *transmission* side, i.e., using the shorthand terminology used in Applicant's Amendment, "precompensation" operations. For example, Claim 1 recites "generating an interference-compensated information symbol from a source information symbol based on knowledge of an information symbol and a first code used to generate a first coded signal" and "concurrently *transmitting* the first coded signal and a second coded signal representing the interference-compensated information symbol encoded according to a second code." Applicant reiterates that Wang clearly does not disclose or suggest such recitations, because the cited material from Wang relates to receiver-side operations. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over Wang. Applicant further submits that independent Claims 21, 29 and 33 are patentable over Wang for at least similar reasons.


Similar reasoning supports the patentability of Claim 17 over Bottomley. The cited material from Bottomley, similar to Wang, relates to various signal processing operations on a *received* signal. In sharp contrast, Claim 17 recites "a method of *transmitting*" that includes similar "precompensation" operations, including "generating an interference-compensated information symbol from a source information symbol based on knowledge of an information symbol and a code from the first group of codes used to generate a first coded signal," and "concurrently *transmitting* the first coded signal and a second coded signal representing the

In re: Essam Sourour
Serial No.: 09/532,357
Filed: March 21, 2000
Page 13 of 13

interference-compensated information symbol encoded according to a code from the second group of codes." Such operations are neither disclosed nor suggested by Bottomley and, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Claim 17 is patentable over Bottomley.

In light of the foregoing (including the previously submitted Applicant's Amendment), Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims. Applicant further submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. Applicant encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone to address any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: September 21, 2004

Robert M. Meeks
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,723

USPTO Customer No. 20792
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401